United Nations A/66/900–S/2012/695

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.: General
11 September 2012

Original: English

General Assembly
Sixty-sixth session
Agenda items 34, 35 and 39

Prevention of armed conflict

Protracted conflicts in the GUAM area and their implications for international peace, security and development

The situation in the occupied territories of Azerbaijan

Security Council
Sixty-seventh year

Letter dated 7 September 2012 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Armenia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

Upon instructions from my Government, I have the honour to draw your attention to the ongoing violations of the ceasefire by the military forces of the Republic of Azerbaijan recorded for August 2012 (see annex).

I should be grateful if you would have the present letter and the annex thereto circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda items 34, 35 and 39, and of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Karine **Khoudaverdian**
Chargé d'affaires a.i.

12-50638 (E) 170912

Please recycle

Annex to the letter dated 7 September 2012 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Armenia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

Violations of the ceasefire by the armed forces of the Republic of Azerbaijan from 1 to 31 August 2012

1. On the borderline of the Nagorno Karabakh Republic:

   Total number of violations — 1,110

   Total number of shots ~ 5,137

   AK ~ 3,467, PK ~ 780, SVD — 635, DSHK ~ 84, Sev net ~ 84, RPK ~ 8, Istigal ~ 34, AGS ~ 45

2. On the borderline of the Republic of Armenia (see table below):

   Total number of violations — 126

   Total number of shots ~ 2,567

   AK ~ 694, PK ~ 1,228, SVD — 89, DSHK ~ 398, Sev net ~ 113, RPK ~ 30, Utyos ~ 15

Number	*Date*	*Direction*	*Time*	*Type of weapon*	*Ammunition*
1.	1 August	Vahan	0200	RPK	30
2.		Movses	1750	DSHK	12
3.		Voskepar	1545	AK	100
4.				Sev net	50
5.	2 August	Chinari	1800	SVD	1
6.		Lev	1835	Utyos	15
7.				Sev net	15
8.				PK	100
9.	3 August	Tigranakert	0120	Sev net	1
10.	4 August	Baghanis	0130	AK	1
11.		Koti	2055	AK	20
12.		Chinari	2220	AK	40
13.				PK	10
14.	5 August	Berqaber	2045	PK	3
15.	6 August	Baghanis	0105	AK	25
16.		Vazashen	0430	AK	10
17.		Lev	1430	DSHK	30
18.				Sev net	10
19.		Berqaber	1540	DSHK	3
20.		Sarigyugh	2010	Sev net	3
21.		Aygepar	2125	AK	6

Number	*Date*	*Direction*	*Time*	*Type of weapon*	*Ammunition*
22.		Nerqin Karmiraghbyur	2315	DSHK	1
23	7 August	Voskevan	0030	AK	7
24.		Voskepar	0045	PK	25
25.		Sevakavan	1005	AK	3
26.		Vazashen	1345	AK	7
27.		Berdavan	1945	AK	5
28.		Movses	2235	AK	6
29.	8 August	Barekamavan	2000	PK	4
30.				AK	5
31.		Berdavan	2110	SVD	4
32.		Aygepar	2210	AK	1
33.			2340		6
34.	9 August	Chinari	1930	DSHK	5
35.				SVD	10
36.				AK	10
37.			2140	DSHK	10
38.				SVD	10
39.				AK	10
40.		Movses	2125	AK	2
41.		Voskepar	2220	AK	5
42.		Baghanis	2345	AK	70
43.	10 August	Vazashen	0545	PK	8
44.		Baghanis	2330	AK	5
45.	11 August	Mehrab	1345	SVD	6
46.				DSHK	11
47.		Dovegh	1815	AK	6
48.				SVD	2
49.		Chinari	2313	AK	7
50.	11 August	Chinari	2313	SVD	2
51.	12 August	Lev	0500	PK	20
52.				Sev net	5
53.		Tigranashen	2350	AK	7
54.	13 August	Vazashen	0335	PK	7
55.		Baghanis	0751	AK	1
56.				PK	6
57.		Aygedzor	1300	Sev net	17
58.		Mount Susuzluk	1630	PK	15
59.		Paravaqar	2210	AK	15
60.	15 August	Paravaqar	0005	AK	12

Number	*Date*	*Direction*	*Time*	*Type of weapon*	*Ammunition*
61.		Chinari	1550	AK	20
62.				SVD	3
63.	16 August	Paravaqar	0155	AK	4
64.		Barekamavan	0900	SVD	2
65.		Aygepar	1855	AK	4
66.		Movses	2040	AK	20
67.	17 August	Eraskh	1905	AK	5
68.		Aygepar	1940	AK	2
69.	18 August	Chinari	1835	AK	4
70.			2000	AK	12
71.	19 August	Eraskh	0810	AK	2
72.		Barekamavan	1150	AK	8
73.	20 August	Vazashen	0115	AK	5
74.		Baghanis	0850	AK	2
75.		Aygepar	2015	AK	1
76.		Tigranakert	2310	AK	4
77.	21 August	Vazashen	1050	AK	16
78.			1845	AK	20
79.		Aygedzor	1200	PK	250
80.		Nerqin Karmiraghbyur	1650	AK	5
81.			2150	DSHK	20
82.				PK	70
83.		Nerqin Karmiraghbyur	2155	PK	10
84.				DSHK	15
85.			2245	PK	50
86.		Aygehovit	1845	PK	10
87.		Movses	2120	PK	14
88.			2220	PK	120
89.				DSHK	90
90.			2230	PK	120
91.		Tigranakert	2200	AK	2
92.		Aygepar	2205	PK	60
93.				DSHK	60
94.			2215	PK	100
95.				DSHK	140
96.		Paravaqar	2235	AK	15
97.		Dovegh	2300	PK	90
98.				AK	40
99.	22 August	Vazashen	2000	AK	15

Number	*Date*	*Direction*	*Time*	*Type of weapon*	*Ammunition*
100.		Barcruni	2130	PK	50
101.	23 August	Chinari	1350	SVD	6
102.		Barcruni	1525	SVD	13
103.				PK	20
104.		Nerqin Karmiraghbyur	1640	AK	20
105.		Voskepar	2150	AK	6
106.	25 August	Barcruni	1745	SVD	10
107.		Berdavan	2110	Sev net	1
108.				SVD	2
109.				AK	5
110.		Aygepar	2320	PK	6
111.	26 August	Yanshak	1100	SVD	10
112.				PK	30
113.		Aygepar	2015	AK	8
114.			2310	AK	4
115.		Baghanis	2150	AK	7
116.	27 August	Eraskh	0730	AK	2
117.			1220	SVD	1
118.			2100	AK	2
119.		Lev	1000-1230	Sev net	10
120.				PK	30
121.		Tigranashen	1903	DSHK	1
122.		Berdavan	2230	SVD	5
123.	29 August	Aygepar	1315	Sev net	1
124.		Berdavan	1805	SVD	2
125.				AK	2
126.	30 August	Berdavan	1200-2215	AK	40

Abbreviations:
PK — Kalashnikov machine gun
SVD — 7.9 mm sniper weapon
AK — Kalashnikov rifle
DSHK — 12.7 mm machine gun
RPK — 5.45 mm machine gun
Utyos — 12.7 mm machine gun
Istigal — 14.5 mm machine gun
Sev net — 12.7 mm sniper weapon
RPG — Rocket-propelled grenade
AGS — Automatic grenade launcher

United Nations A/66/901

General Assembly

Distr.: General
14 September 2012

Original: English

Sixty-sixth session
Agenda item 98
General and complete disarmament

Letter dated 9 September 2012 from the Permanent Representative of Turkey to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to transmit herewith the Istanbul Statement of the Foreign Ministers of the Non-Proliferation and Disarmament Initiative, following its meeting held on 16 June 2012, in Istanbul.

I would be grateful if the present letter and the annex thereto could be circulated as a document of the sixty-sixth session of the General Assembly, under agenda item 98, "General and complete disarmament".

(*Signed*) Ertuğrul **Apakan**

12-50982 (E) 180912

Please recycle

Annex to the letter dated 9 September 2012 from the Permanent Representative of Turkey to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

Istanbul Statement of the Foreign Ministers of the Non-Proliferation and Disarmament Initiative

1. We, the Foreign Ministers of Australia, Canada, Chile, Germany, Japan, Mexico, the Netherlands, Poland, Turkey and the United Arab Emirates reconfirm our commitment to addressing nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation issues of common concern; reaffirm our deep commitment to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) as the essential foundation for the achievement of nuclear disarmament, the cornerstone of the global nuclear non-proliferation regime and the basis for the development of the peaceful use of nuclear energy.

2. Committed to the universalization and effective implementation of the NPT across all its three pillars, we reiterate our pledge to actively work towards the implementation of the conclusions and recommendations for follow-on actions contained in the Final Document of the 2010 NPT Review Conference.

3. We welcome the deliberations and results of the first session of the Preparatory Committee for the 2015 Review Conference that took place from 30 April to 11 May 2012 in Vienna. The factual summary of the Chairman of the Preparatory Committee acknowledged some progress in the implementation of the commitments contained in the 2010 Final Document, but at the same time clearly recognized what remains to be done. In this light we highlight that the Non-Proliferation and Disarmament Initiative (NPDI) as a group played a visible and constructive role during the session of the Preparatory Committee, including through its submission of working papers to the Preparatory Committee.

4. We take note of the information provided by some nuclear-weapon States to the Preparatory Committee on their concrete steps towards disarmament taken or announced since the 2010 Review Conference. We stress the need for continued and systematic reductions in all nuclear weapons categories, including non-strategic nuclear weapons. We call upon all nuclear-weapon States to intensify efforts to reduce and eventually eliminate all types of nuclear weapons, deployed and non-deployed, in a transparent, verifiable and irreversible manner.

5. We also take note of the continued discussions by the nuclear-weapon States on the issues of transparency, mutual confidence and verification with a view to reporting to the 2014 Preparatory Committee. We look forward to a transparent outcome of the third P5 conference in Washington from 27 to 29 June 2012, particularly on possible steps to make tangible progress in the implementation of issues outlined in Actions 5 and 21 of the 2010 NPT Action Plan. We urge transparency in their work and express particular interest in their perspectives on reducing the size of nuclear arsenals, the role of nuclear weapons in military and security policies and the operational status of nuclear weapon systems, transparency and confidence-building.

6. We recall the development by the Non-Proliferation and Disarmament Initiative in 2011 of a draft standard reporting form to encourage progress in the

implementation of Action 21 on confidence-building. We have today agreed to seek further responses to the form in the capitals of nuclear-weapon States and to continue to contribute to discussions on the implementation of Action 21.

7. While the nuclear-weapons States have a special responsibility in nuclear disarmament, the development of the draft reporting form is an example of the contribution that the non-nuclear-weapon States can make.

8. We express our deep concern and frustration with the continued stalemate in the Conference on Disarmament. The Conference on Disarmament must agree on and implement a comprehensive programme of work that starts substantive work on the four core issues of the Conference on Disarmament, notably the immediate commencement of negotiations on a treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons and other nuclear explosive devices on the basis of document CD/1299 and the mandate contained therein. Such a treaty remains an essential step towards a world without nuclear weapons.

9. We call upon all nuclear-weapon States and States not party to the NPT to declare and maintain voluntary moratoria on the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons and other explosive devices, pending the negotiation and entry into force of a treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons and other explosive devices. We also welcome and fully support steps taken to remove fissile material from military programmes. However, in light of continued production of fissile material for weapons purposes by some States, we underline, at the same time, that such unilateral measures cannot substitute comprehensive, non-discriminatory, multilateral, legally binding, irreversible and effectively verifiable commitments. We underline the need to commence negotiations on a treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons and other explosive devices without further delay and, on the basis of United Nations General Assembly resolution 66/44, we are prepared to consider options should the Conference on Disarmament fail to agree on and implement a comprehensive programme of work by the end of its current session. We intend to address this issue in further detail at the next Non-Proliferation and Disarmament Initiative ministerial meeting.

10. In view of General Assembly resolution 66/44 and building on previous initiatives by members of the Non-Proliferation and Disarmament Initiative to examine technical aspects of a treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons and other explosive devices, we support expert-level meetings in Geneva initiated this year by Germany and the Netherlands in support of the commencement of negotiations. We encourage all States to actively participate in and contribute to such meetings.

11. The cessation of nuclear-weapon test explosions and any other nuclear explosions constitutes the core element of the international non-proliferation and disarmament regime. We pursue determined efforts for the entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty and its universalization, as an essential component of our broader work towards reducing and eventually eliminating all nuclear weapons. We appeal to all countries that have not yet become parties to the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, in particular to the remaining Annex II States whose ratifications are required for the entry into force of the Treaty, to sign and ratify it unconditionally and without delay. We welcome, in this respect, the ratification of the Treaty by Indonesia on 6 February 2012. We also welcome the

recent ratifications of Ghana, Guinea, Trinidad and Tobago, the Central African Republic and Guatemala, as well as the signature by Niue. We express hope that other States moving forward towards ratification will soon finalize their internal procedures and follow suit.

12. Pending the entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, all undertakings relating to that treaty contained in the 2010 NPT Action Plan should be duly fulfilled. We call upon all States to uphold and maintain moratoria on nuclear weapon test explosions and any other nuclear explosions. We underline, however, that while moratoria serve as important confidence-building measures, they cannot take the place of legally binding commitments that are indispensable for the effectiveness and verifiability of the regime. We express continued support for the substantial work undertaken by the Preparatory Commission of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization in building up all elements of the Treaty's verification regime, in particular its International Monitoring System and on-site inspections.

13. We have long supported the widest adherence to key nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation instruments and have been active individually to encourage States that have not concluded these instruments to do so. Building on this work, we have now agreed to act collectively and systematically and have resolved to develop a work programme to encourage the widest adherence to these instruments by the time of the 2015 NPT Review Conference.

14. We continue to work on practical steps that the Non-Proliferation and Disarmament Initiative could take to strengthen the effectiveness and efficiency of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards system, which constitutes a key component of the global non-proliferation regime. Recognizing the particular role of the Additional Protocol as an effective confidence-building measure, as well as an early warning mechanism, we call upon all States that have not yet concluded an Additional Protocol to do so without delay. We encourage them to start voluntarily implementing the provisions of the Additional Protocol pending its entry into force. We continue to share our experience and best practices, as well as to offer legal and practical assistance in the conclusion and implementation of additional protocols, to interested States in concert with IAEA. We will continue to actively promote the IAEA Comprehensive Safeguards Agreement in combination with an Additional Protocol as the international verification standard.

15. The role of export controls is crucial to achieving nuclear non-proliferation obligation under paragraph 2 of article III of NPT. We urge all States to establish, develop, review and maintain appropriate effective national export controls over both nuclear and nuclear-related dual-use items and technology, including as described by United Nations Security Council resolution 1540 (2004). We will share our experience and information in the field of export controls.

16. We remain committed to the objective of a nuclear-weapons-free world. We are resolved to support efforts towards reducing nuclear proliferation risks by ensuring compliance with the international non-proliferation regime. Deeply concerned by specific longstanding non-compliance issues, we strongly urge the immediate resolution of all cases of non-compliance with safeguards obligations, in full conformity with the IAEA Statute and member States' respective legal obligations. We discussed issues of particular concern to the NPT regime.

17. As an important model of cooperation and an effective confidence-building measure, we encourage and support the establishment of internationally recognized and effectively verifiable nuclear-weapon-free zones, on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among States of the regions concerned and in accordance with the 1999 guidelines of the United Nations Disarmament Commission.

18. We affirm our support for the practical steps endorsed by the 2010 Review Conference on the implementation of the 1995 resolution of the Review Conference on the establishment of a zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East, including the convening of a conference in 2012 to be attended by all States of the region. We welcome the appointment of Under-Secretary of State Jaakko Laajava of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Finland as facilitator and the designation of Finland to host the conference. We take note of the report submitted by Ambassador Laajava and subsequent discussions at the 2012 session of the Preparatory Committee. Having had further exchanges in the course of our Istanbul Meeting with his representative, we express our full support for the Facilitator's efforts and broad consultations to prepare common ground for a successful conference and call upon all stakeholders to engage in the process inclusively and transparently. Mindful of the importance of a successful conference, we call for genuine and constructive engagement by, first and foremost, all States of the region as well as the international community.

19. We recall the inalienable right of States Parties to the NPT to develop and use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, in full compliance with their NPT obligations, without undue restrictions. We support efforts to expand the peaceful applications of nuclear energy, science and technology to the benefit of all humanity. We underline the central role of IAEA in the field of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy and are determined to ensure that IAEA continues to have the expertise, authority and resources needed to fulfil its statutory functions in facilitating technical cooperation and in coordinating international efforts to strengthen global nuclear safety and security.

20. We welcome the successful convening of the second Nuclear Security Summit in Seoul on 26 and 27 March 2012 on strengthening nuclear security, preventing illicit trafficking of nuclear materials and reducing the threat of nuclear terrorism. We fully support the objectives of the Nuclear Security Summit and welcome the hosting of the 2014 Summit in the Netherlands. We also support efforts by IAEA to strengthen the international nuclear safety framework, including through the implementation of the IAEA Nuclear Safety Action Plan. We are prepared to work with other countries for the success of the Fukushima Ministerial Conference on Nuclear Safety, to be held in December 2012, for further strengthening of nuclear safety worldwide.

21. We welcome the efforts of the Global Partnership Against the Spread of Weapons and Materials of Mass Destruction in implementing concrete projects to address the threat posed by the proliferation of weapons and materials of mass destruction, as well as related knowledge. We also recognize the contributions of the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism in countering the challenges posed by nuclear terrorism and illicit trafficking of nuclear and other radioactive materials.

22. Expressing concern about the catastrophic humanitarian consequences of any use of nuclear weapons and in full cognizance of their longstanding, far-reaching and irredeemable effects, and also in order to raise greater awareness about our

policies in support of nuclear non-proliferation, arms control and disarmament and to ensure broad support for these principles at the national, regional and global levels, we underline the importance of promoting and maintaining a culture of peace in our societies. We are further resolved to empower members of our societies with the necessary awareness, knowledge and skills to make their own contribution, as national and world citizens, to the realization of the global disarmament and non-proliferation objectives. We, therefore, recognize the importance of disarmament and non-proliferation education as an integral part of our joint work. We welcome and look forward to the Global Forum on Disarmament and Non-Proliferation Education, which will be held in Nagasaki in August.

23. Civil society has an important role to play in the field of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. We welcome the active participation of civil society in the 2012 Preparatory Committee and recognize their substantial and enduring contributions to the NPT review process. We will intensify our outreach activities to promote the objectives of the Non-Proliferation and Disarmament Initiative, as well as to develop political dialogue and practical cooperation with partners who can contribute to our efforts.

24. We agree to meet again in September, on the margins of the United Nations General Assembly in New York, to review the progress achieved and identify future prospects. The 2013 and 2014 ministerial meetings of our initiative will be hosted by the Netherlands and Japan respectively.

Istanbul, 16 June 2012

United Nations A/66/902

General Assembly

Distr.: General
14 September 2012

Original: English

Sixty-sixth session
Item 124
United Nations reform: measures and proposals

Report of the open-ended intergovernmental process to conduct open, transparent and inclusive negotiations on how to strengthen and enhance the effective functioning of the human rights treaty body system

Note by the President of the General Assembly

The General Assembly, in its resolution 66/254 of 23 February 2012, requested the President of the General Assembly to launch an open-ended intergovernmental process to conduct open, transparent and inclusive negotiations on how to strengthen and enhance the effective functioning of the human rights treaty body system, and to appoint two co-facilitators to assist in that process. Pursuant to that request, on 11 April 2012, I appointed Greta Gunnarsdottir, Permanent Representative of Iceland to the United Nations, and Desra Percaya, Permanent Representative of Indonesia to the United Nations, as co-facilitators of the process.

I now have the pleasure to transmit herewith the report of the co-facilitators on the intergovernmental process of the General Assembly on strengthening and enhancing the effective functioning of the human rights treaty body system, containing the deliberations and recommendations of the intergovernmental process (see annex).

12-50988 (E) 240912

Please recycle

Annex

Report of the open-ended intergovernmental process to conduct open, transparent and inclusive negotiations on how to strengthen and enhance the effective functioning of the human rights treaty body system

Contents

		Page
I.	Introduction and overview	3
II.	Work of the co-facilitators during the sixty-sixth session of the General Assembly	3
III.	Organization of work	4
IV.	Themes and non-exhaustive list of issues	5
V.	Consultations with chairpersons of the human rights treaty bodies	6
VI.	Civil society forum	6
VII.	Recommendations	7
Appendix		
	Non-exhaustive list of issues	8

I. Introduction and overview

1. On 23 February 2012, the General Assembly adopted resolution 66/254, entitled "Intergovernmental process of the General Assembly on strengthening and enhancing the effective functioning of the human rights treaty body system". The resolution requests the President of the General Assembly to:

(a) Launch within the framework of the Assembly, an open-ended intergovernmental process to conduct open, transparent and inclusive negotiations on how to strengthen and enhance the effective functioning of the human rights treaty body system, and to appoint two co-facilitators to assist him in this process.

(b) Establish appropriate channels of communication with the President of the Human Rights Council and to work out separate informal arrangements, after consultation with Member States, that would allow the open-ended intergovernmental process to benefit from the inputs and expertise of the human rights treaty bodies, national human rights institutions and relevant non-governmental organizations, bearing in mind the intergovernmental nature of the process.

(c) Report by the end of the sixty-sixth session on the deliberations and recommendations of the open-ended intergovernmental process for further consideration by the Assembly, including consideration of a possible extension of the process.

2. This report serves to inform Member States of the deliberations of the intergovernmental process as requested in the resolution.

3. In the United Nations Secretary-General's reports A/HRC/19/28 and A/66/344, he informed Member States about the challenges that the treaty bodies system was currently facing and recommended some measures that could be adopted to address the situation, in the short and long term. This laid the groundwork for future discussions of Member States on the issue.

4. In addition, the recent report of the High Commissioner contained in document A/66/860 was published on the basis of her extensive consultations with many different stakeholders. In so doing she had attempted to approach this issue in a comprehensive way and provide Member States with information and recommendations on many aspects of the treaty body system.

II. Work of the co-facilitators during the sixty-sixth session of the General Assembly

5. In a letter dated 11 April 2012, the President of the General Assembly appointed H.E. Ms. Greta Gunnarsdottir, Permanent Representative of Iceland, and H.E. Mr. Desra Percaya, Permanent Representative of Indonesia, to jointly co-facilitate the process on his behalf.

6. The co-facilitators have held numerous consultations including:

(a) Two informal meetings with Member States, on 12 June and 2 July 2012, respectively.

(b) Numerous bilateral consultations with Member States.

(c) A videoconference with the Chairs of the treaty bodies on 25 June 2012.

(d) Thematic discussions on 16-18 July 2012, with treaty body experts, representatives from national human rights institutions and civil society participating as resource persons.

(e) A civil society forum on 4 September 2012 to provide an opportunity for civil society to contribute to the discussion on strengthening and enhancing the effective functioning of the human rights treaty body system.

(f) Informal-informals on 6, 10, 11 and 12 September 2012 to discuss a draft resolution as an outcome of the sixty-sixth session of the General Assembly.

III. Organization of work

7. At the meeting with Member States on 12 June 2012 a number of Member States expressed the wish that the co-facilitators would be able to move the process forward as agreed in the resolution. Nonetheless, delegations were mindful of other meetings and consultations scheduled to take place during the final months of the sixty-sixth session of the General Assembly.

8. Among the meetings highlighted by delegations were in particular Rio+20, the substantive session of the Economic and Social Council and the United Nations Conference on the Arms Trade Treaty. In order to avoid conflicts in schedules, the co-facilitators presented a timeline to Member States that would allow them time to consider new reports, such as the High Commissioner's report mentioned in the resolution, and bring the substantive discussion forward.

9. General Assembly resolution 66/254, in its operative paragraphs 4 and 6, reaffirms that the deliberations in the framework of the open-ended intergovernmental process should be open to all States Members of the United Nations, observer States, relevant intergovernmental organizations and relevant United Nations bodies. It also requested the President of the General Assembly to work out separate informal arrangements, after consultation with Member States, that would allow the open-ended intergovernmental process to benefit from the inputs and expertise of the human rights treaty bodies, national human rights institutions and relevant non-governmental organizations.

10. Bearing in mind these provisions, there were varying views among Member States regarding how best to benefit from the inputs and expertise of the human rights treaty bodies, national human rights institutions and relevant non-governmental organizations.

11. The co-facilitators therefore consulted with a number of delegations as well as heard the views of Member States on the issue in the informals held and made, without prejudice to any future format of engagement with these actors, a number of observations on how best to organize their participation in the intergovernmental process.

12. Following these consultations, in which national human rights institutions and non-governmental organizations participated, Paris-Principle compliant national human rights institutions and those non-governmental organizations in consultative status with the Economic and Social Council were able to interact directly in order to voice their views on various issues of concern. Furthermore, NGOs not in

consultative status with the Economic and Social Council were able to participate after consultations with Member States on a non-objection basis. Additionally, national human rights institutions made an intervention at the opening of the thematic discussions (16-18 July).

13. The co-facilitators noted that various delegations had underlined the distinct competences as well as experience of different stakeholders to the furtherance of the issue, and hence called for the participation of such stakeholders, in particular that of the experts of the human rights treaty bodies. Responding to this, the co-facilitators invited the chair and the vice-chair of the meeting of chairpersons of the human rights treaty bodies to act as resource persons during the thematic discussions from 16 to 18 July. The co-facilitators also suggested that all chairpersons of the human rights treaty bodies act as focal points for communication with their respective committees and encouraged continued discussion within each committee.

IV. Themes and non-exhaustive list of issues

14. To accommodate the views expressed by Member States during the informal meetings on 12 June and 2 July 2012, particularly the need to engage in a structured discussion on themes relevant for strengthening the functioning of the treaty body system, the co-facilitators based the following consultations on thematic clustering of issues.

15. Thematic consultations were held from 16 to 18 July 2012, designed to provide Member States with the opportunity to discuss the thematic clustering of issues proposed by the co-facilitators, as well as any issues deemed crucial by Member States in the context of the intergovernmental process.

16. An initial non-exhaustive list of themes was presented by the co-facilitators, taken from various submissions and comments by Member States, reports submitted by the United Nations Secretary-General and the High Commissioner for Human Rights, as well as from other relevant sources, related to strengthening and enhancing the effective functioning of the human rights treaty body system.

17. These themes were:

(a) The recommendation of the High Commissioner on a master calendar;

(b) The reporting process;

(c) Methods of work;

(d) Capacity to implement.

18. The resourcing of the treaty body system was addressed as a cross-cutting issue throughout the discussions. The four themes were intentionally broad in order to enable different issues to be raised within their scope. Finally, a non-exhaustive list of issues which was developed under each theme was shared with all Member States before the 16 to 18 July 2012 consultations so as to facilitate discussions.

19. During the thematic discussions Member States actively contributed on a number of issues, including those on the list of non-exhaustive issues that was previously circulated. In addition, a number of alternative proposals, excellent questions and comments for furthering the discussion on many of these issues were

raised. The co-facilitators have attempted to capture additional issues raised by Member States in the appendix to this report.

20. In the view of the co-facilitators, the discussion revealed that there is already common ground on some of the issues while others require certain adjustments based on Member States' views. Others still require further clarification as indicated by Member States, such as resources, the master calendar and capacity-building.

21. Some delegations were of the view that certain issues could possibly be addressed in the short term, including the simplified reporting procedure, the requirements of summary records, webcasting and videoconference availability, a handbook on expectations, availability and required workload of treaty body experts, the need to address backlogs and coordinated requests for additional meeting time and the need for focused treaty body concluding observations.

22. Some delegations were of the inclination not to focus only on the above-mentioned issues, and conveyed the preference to discuss all issues on an equal footing, in the hope of coming up with a comprehensive agreement.

V. Consultations with chairpersons of the human rights treaty bodies

23. On 25 June 2012, at the request of the chairpersons of the human rights treaty bodies who were meeting in Addis Ababa, the co-facilitators met with the chairpersons by videoconference. The chairpersons provided a number of inputs to the co-facilitators, including:

(a) That each treaty body has participated constructively and actively in the process of the High Commissioner for Human Rights and that the chairpersons hoped to continue to do so in the intergovernmental process.

(b) Highlighting the current efforts of the treaty bodies in strengthening their work, including their efforts to formulate guidelines for their work and to harmonize their working methods, while also noting the differences between the treaty bodies.

(c) Expressing their appreciation for the report of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, especially the recommendation on a master calendar.

VI. Civil society forum

24. A civil society forum, held on 4 September 2012, was intended to provide a platform and give an opportunity to civil society to contribute to the discussion in the intergovernmental process.

25. The forum utilized videoconferencing to garner more participants from venues in New York and Geneva. Participants extended their appreciation of the efforts of the co-facilitators, while some suggested that a wider inclusion of organizations was needed from various regional areas.

26. Various concerns were conveyed by representatives of civil society organizations, both on procedural and substantive issues. In terms of the procedural arrangements put in place to facilitate their inputs, some civil society actors commented that they felt that for their role in the outcome of the intergovernmental

process to be sufficient, additional arrangements needed to be made. To this end some suggestions were sent to the co-facilitators for their consideration.

VII. Recommendations

27. Given the relatively short amount of time for Member States to deliberate and consider the numerous issues raised so far during the intergovernmental process of the General Assembly on strengthening and enhancing the effective functioning of the human rights treaty body system, no specific recommendations for action were finalized.

28. The co-facilitators considered the overall approach of Member States during the process as positive and constructive. Based on these discussions, there is clearly a need and basis for further consultations. It is therefore recommended that the General Assembly decide to extend the intergovernmental process of the General Assembly on strengthening and enhancing the effective functioning of the human rights treaty body system to the sixty-seventh session of the General Assembly.

29. For clarity, certain issues require more information, including, among others, those related to resourcing of the treaty body system. The co-facilitators therefore recommend that a comprehensive cost review of the treaty body system be provided in a background note to the renewed intergovernmental process by the end of 2012. The background note could contain detailed information on a number of costing issues, including the cost of the current system, including for conference services and documentation, as well as the additional resources required to clear the current backlog, the assessed allocation needed to fully service the current system and the unit cost of each element of the treaty body system.

Appendix

Non-exhaustive list of issues

The co-facilitators developed a non-exhaustive list of issues to provide some structure to the discussions in the intergovernmental process. Each theme is intentionally broad to enable different issues to be raised and the list below should be viewed as indicative. Resourcing of the treaty body system should be addressed as a cross-cutting issue as was done during the thematic discussions.[a]

I. Master calendar

Overview

To achieve greater clarity on timing, greater efficiency, and generally greater access to the reporting process, the High Commissioner has proposed a comprehensive reporting calendar. As proposed, the calendar would combine all current reporting deadlines into a single system, based on a periodic five-year cycle. Within this five-year period, there would be a maximum of two reports per annum for States that have ratified all treaties. After the submission of a report a period of six months would follow for other stakeholders to provide supplementary information and then another six months for the concerned treaty body to prepare for the interactive dialogue. This would mean that over five years, any State would have submitted all reports due under all treaties, and that every report would be examined within one year following its submission.

Non-exhaustive list of issues

1. **Opportunities for optimizing treaty bodies work** — What opportunities for optimizing treaty body work does the Master Calendar provide?

2. **Modalities and order of consideration of reports** — What issues arise from how the reports are divided between the years; are there, for example, reports that are more appropriately considered during the same year or even at the same time?

3. **Length of cycle** — What is the most appropriate length of a cycle of consideration in the context of the master calendar?

4. **The required resources, both immediate and incremental, and possible long-term savings** — The master calendar requires resources both in the short and the long term. At the same time it will have cost savings in the long term due to increased efficiencies.

[a] These themes emerged from State submissions and comments, as well as from other stakeholders, the recent report of the High Commissioner for Human Rights and the previous reports of the Secretary-General.

II. Methods of work

Overview

This theme addresses issues such as strengthening the independence and expertise of treaty body members, individual communications procedures, inquiries, country visits and the enhanced visibility and accessibility of the treaty bodies.

Non-exhaustive list of issues

1. **Guidelines on independence and impartiality of members of the human rights treaty bodies in the exercise of their functions** — Guidelines adopted by the chairpersons of the treaty bodies to guarantee the independence and impartiality of treaty body members.

2. **Webcasting to enhance the accessibility and visibility of treaty bodies at country level** — Webcasting of all public meetings of the treaty bodies to gain transparency and participation of relevant stakeholders in the reporting process.

3. **Videoconferencing** — Using videoconferencing technologies to facilitate the participation of different actors in all steps of the reporting process.

4. **A handbook on expectations, availability and required workload and a centralized treaty body elections website** — A handbook containing the established facts and information on the election process, conditions and other relevant requirements pertaining to membership of a treaty body, particularly to highlight the practical expectations and workload for treaty body experts.

5. **Proposals for policies and processes with respect to the nomination and elections of experts to the treaty bodies** — Ideas related to national initiatives to ensure transparency and the nomination of highly qualified experts, the election process and terms for treaty body experts.

6. **Open public space for all State Parties to present their potential candidates or nominees for treaty bodies** — An open space, moderated by five former treaty body members, using modern technologies, including social media, to ensure an open and transparent selection process.

7. **Strengthening the meetings of State Parties** — The idea of strengthening the dialogue of State Parties at the regular meeting of State Parties, for example through a regular relevant agenda item on those issues that affect the full and effective implementation of the treaty during meetings/conferences of State Parties.

8. **Other measures to enhance the visibility and accessibility of the treaty body system** — The idea of an OHCHR communications strategy to better disseminate the treaty body outputs as well as other measures such as using social media, enhancing the OHCHR website, using the Universal Human Rights Index to cluster recommendations, establishing a public database for individual communications etc.

9. **Establishment of a treaty body jurisprudence database on individual cases including information on their follow-up** — The idea of a database, searchable in all six United Nations languages, containing all individual cases from all the complaints mechanisms.

10. **Joint treaty body working group on communications** — A joint body, composed of experts from the different treaty bodies to deal with individual communications in order to achieve a more coherent jurisprudence.

11. **Enhancing the capacity of the Subcommittee on Prevention of Torture** — To increase the capacity of the Subcommittee on Prevention of Torture to undertake more regular and advisory follow-up visits.

12. **Review of good practices regarding the application of rules of procedure and methods of work and adoption of common guidelines** — The idea of presenting common written guidelines on procedural matters related to the handling of the individual communications and the conduct of inquiries.

13. **Friendly settlements** — The idea of providing space for friendly settlements if parties are engaged in a dialogue to reach a common conclusion.

III. Reporting process

Overview

This theme addresses such issues as the reporting process, including simplified reporting process (list of issues), page limitations, reduction or elimination of summary records, focused concluding observations, common core documents.

Non-exhaustive list of issues to discuss

1. "**Simplified reporting procedure**" — Optional "simplified reporting procedure" or what is commonly referred to as "Lists of issues prior to reporting".

2. **The reduction of translation of summary records or their replacement by webcasting** — The idea of moving conference services resources away from summary records or replacing them with webcasting.

3. **Submission of common core documents and regular updates** — The optional submission of a common base report that is common to all the treaties and replaces the submission of individual reports to each treaty body.

4. **Aligned methodology for the constructive dialogue between States Parties and treaty bodies** — The idea that all treaty bodies adopt an aligned methodology in the form of written guidelines for the constructive dialogue between States Parties and treaty bodies. The objective would be to maximize the use of the time available and allow for a more interactive and productive dialogue with States Parties in the context of the reporting process.

5. **Aligned methodology for the procedures for consideration of individual communications** — The idea of elaborating common written

guidelines on procedural matters related to the handling of individual communications.

6. **Addressing backlogs and coordinated requests for additional meeting time** — How to address the current backlog of reports and the idea that requests for adjustments of committee meeting time be addressed in a single comprehensive annual or biannual request.

7. **Focused treaty body concluding observations** — The adoption of measures to adopt shorter, focused, concrete and achievable concluding observations.

8. **Strict adherence to page limitations** — The enforcement of the "Harmonized guidelines on reporting under the international human rights treaties, including guidelines on a common core document and treaty-specific documents" which sets out guidelines of page limitation for State reports.

9. **Further institutionalization of engagement with other United Nations partners** — Further institutionalized cooperation of treaty bodies with other United Nations entities to provide the most efficient support to States Parties and other stakeholders in the preparation, review and follow-up to States Parties review by treaty bodies.

10. **Aligned models of interaction among treaty bodies, national human rights institutions and civil society organizations** — Harmonize the way the treaty bodies engage with civil society organizations and national human rights institutions.

11. **Reprisals** — Harmonized approach and necessary measures to prevent reprisals against human rights defenders, victims and witnesses and take appropriate action to provide remedies.

IV. Capacity to implement

Overview

This theme addresses issues such as capacity-building activities related to reporting, national reporting and coordination mechanisms, treaty body follow-up measures, aligned consultation process for general comments and general recommendations.

Non-exhaustive list of issues

1. **The treaty bodies' follow-up procedures** — Simplified and improved procedures for follow-up of the recommendations issued by the treaty bodies, requesting the reporting States to provide written reports on the developments regarding specific recommendations.

2. **Aligned consultation process for the elaboration of General Comments/General recommendations** — A standardized process involving State Parties, United Nations entities, national human rights institutions and

civil society organizations when drafting general comments and general recommendations.

3. **Capacity-building activities relating to reporting** — Capacity-building activities by United Nations agencies at the national level to improve reporting, available on request from States Parties.

4. **A standing national reporting and coordination mechanism** — The idea of a permanent national mechanism to facilitate both timely reporting and improved coordination in follow-up to the recommendations of all United Nations human rights mechanisms.

United Nations A/66/903–S/2012/705

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.: General
14 September 2012

Original: English

General Assembly
Sixty-sixth session
Agenda items 67 and 83

Security Council
Sixty-seventh year

Elimination of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance

The rule of law at the national and international levels

Letter dated 12 September 2012 from the Permanent Representative of Hungary to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

Recalling the letter dated 31 August 2012 from the Permanent Representative of Armenia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General on the Armenian decision to suspend diplomatic ties with Hungary (A/66/896-S/2012/681), I have the honour to transmit herewith a letter from Janos Martonyi, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Hungary, addressed to Eduard Nalbandian, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Armenia (see annex).

The Government of Hungary would like to point out that the transfer of convicted felons to their national authorities for further imprisonment is a routine element of mutual legal assistance. Hungary's actions to proceed with the transfer of Ramil Safarov are in line with the letter and spirit of the 1983 Strasbourg Convention.

The suspension of diplomatic ties is particularly regrettable in cases where there is no unlawful action by the other country.

Based on the principle of settling international disputes through negotiations, and referring to the essential role diplomatic relations play in fostering the development of friendly relations among nations, Hungary stands ready to reinstate diplomatic relations with the Republic of Armenia as soon as possible.

I should be grateful if you would have the present letter and the annex thereto circulated as a document of the sixty-sixth session of the General Assembly, under agenda items 67 and 83, and of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Csaba **Kőrösi**
Permanent Representative

12-51060 (E) 180912

Please recycle

Annex to the letter dated 12 September 2012 from the Permanent Representative of Hungary to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

Letter from Janos Martonyi, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Hungary, addressed to Eduard Nalbandian, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Armenia

Budapest, 6 September 2012

I have learned with regret that the Government of the Republic of Armenia has decided to suspend its diplomatic relations with Hungary. This decision has taken Hungarian public opinion by surprise, since our peoples are connected by traditionally friendly bonds going back centuries. My country has offered refuge to Armenians who wanted to settle down, and who often went on to become honoured and greatly respected members of the Hungarian nation.

In the past few years, the relations between Hungary and the Republic of Armenia have started to strengthen in a much welcome way. In November 2009, President Serzh Sargsyan paid a visit of historic significance to Budapest, during which our relations in the field of signing agreements were also widened. In May 2011, the Speaker of the Hungarian National Assembly visited Yerevan. We were also looking forward to the visit of the Speaker of the Armenian National Assembly planned for September this year.

The suspension of diplomatic relations is a grave decision, entailing incalculable consequences, which, I am convinced, does not serve the interests of the Republic of Armenia and the Armenian people. Hungary has always made efforts to maintain balanced relations with all the peoples of the Southern Caucasus, and has, according to her capabilities, contributed to the peaceful resolution of conflicts, by taking into consideration the interests of all the parties concerned, and to preserving the security of the region.

No country in the region is interested in the escalation of the tension in the Southern Caucasus. We support the Co-Chairs of the Minsk Group of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe in their efforts to find a framework for a negotiated settlement to the Nagorno-Karabakh issue on the basis of the "Madrid principles".

I would like to take this opportunity to underline in the most emphatic way: the extradition of Ramil Sahib Safarov, an Azeri citizen, to the Republic of Azerbaijan so that he could serve the remaining part of his life sentence is in conformity with the international legal norms in force today, and corresponds with the practice that Hungary generally adopts in similar cases. This is a bilateral, purely legal matter which was not directed against Armenia, and can in no way be regarded as an insult to the Armenian people. Hungary disapproves of the subsequent Azeri procedure, and has repeatedly voiced her disapproval.

I would like to assure you that Hungary continues to be interested in developing our relations. I am convinced that the best way to serve the prosperity of our countries would be if, on the basis of the Christian values that have established a bond between the Hungarian and Armenian people for a thousand years, we jointly tried to find a way that could lead us back to further strengthening the friendly relations between Hungary and the Republic of Armenia.

(*Signed*) Janos **Martonyi**